1	CHARLES F. PREUSS (State Bar No. 45783) BRENDA N. BUONAIUTO (State Bar No. 173919) MATTHEW P. SMITH (State Bar No. 247957)
2	DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
3	A Delaware Limited Liability Partnership 50 Fremont Street, 20 th Floor
4	San Francisco, California 94105 Telephone: (415) 591-7500
5	Facsimile: (415) 591-7510
6	Attorneys for Defendants ORTHO-MCNEIL PHARMACEUTICAL, INC.
7	and MCKESSON CORPORATION
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
11	CHOLE ALLEN, an individual; LISA Case P. 7
12	ANDERSON, an individual; LAUREN ANDREAS, an individual; BRANDI DEFENDANTS' AN
13	BAILEY, an individual; COENEKA BALL, PLAINTIFFS' FIR
14	individual; TIESHIA BAMSEY, an TRIAL
15	individual; TERTULIETTE BELIARD, an individual; TAMELA BLACKMAN, an
16	individual; DELORES BONNER, an individual; JASMINE BOX, a minor, by
17	and through her guardian ad litem SCHARLETTA BOX; LACI BRIGNAC,
18	an individual; JERHONDA BROWN, an individual; DAMITA BYNUM, an
	individual; QUIEONNA CARPENTER, an individual; ERIKA CARR, an individual;
19	WENDY CARRIGAN, an individual; M. CHARLOTTE CHEATHAM, an
20	individual; SHERIE COLLINS, an
21	individual; KERRI COOPER, an individual; TERRY COREAU, an individual;
22	MARANDA CRUMEDY, an individual; CENNIE DARBY, an individual; JOEY
23	DAVIS, an individual; SUSAN DOMAN, an individual; ALCOLA EDWARDS, an
24	individual; SARAH EVANS, an individual;

TRYSHA GRAVES, an individual;

RHONDA GRANJA, an individual;

ALEJANDRINA GARZA, an individual; GERALDINE GILLIGAN, an individual;

STACY GREENWOOD, an individual;

REBECCA GRICE, an individual; SARAH GRIFFITH, an individual; DOROTHY GURERRIER, an individual; TAMIERA

ENDANTS' ANSWER TO INTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED IPLAINT: DEMAND FOR JURY

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

SF1\387608\1

25

26

27

1	HARRIS, an individual; MICHELE HELKENN, an individual; NADIA
2	HERNANDEZ, an individual; COURTNEY
3	HEWETT, a minor by and through her guardian ad litem, ANNETTE HEWETT;
4	ROCKENIA HUDSON, an individual; JENNIFER JACKSON, an individual;
5	CLARICE JENKINS, an individual; KRYSTAL JENNINGS, an individual;
6	TIFFANY JENSEN (PENKE), an individual; CANDIS JOHNSON, an
7	individual; DOMONIQUE JOHNSON, an individual; JANNOEL JOHNSON, an
8	individual; MICHELLE JOHNSON, an individual; NICOLE JOHNSON, an
9	individual; TAMMY JONES, an individual; TIARA JOYNER, an individual;
10	AMANDA KING, an individual; YANA KRISHTAL, an individual; VALERIE
11	LANE, a minor by and through her guardian ad litem, VIVIAN LANE; DANA LEWIS,
12	an individual; MARY LEWIS, an individual; DARCI LIDSTER, an individual; MICHELLE LOCKET, an
13	individual; MICHELLE LOCKET, an individual; DENISE LUCERO, an
14	individual; MICHELLE LOCKET, an individual; DENISE LUCERO, an individual; VIRGINIA MANGANO, an individual; TRACI MARGIIOTTA, an individual; LENIKA MCNAIR, an individual; ARIES MITCHELL an individual; ARIES MITCHELL an
15	individual; LENIKA MCNAIR, an individual; JUDY MICKENS, an
16	individual; ARIES MITCHELL, an individual; TOSHEA MORGAN, an individual; STAPHANIE MULLINGS, an individual; TYREE NEAL, an individual;
17	individual; STAPHANIE MULLINGS, an individual; TYREE NEAL, an individual;
18	PARKER, an individual; ERINA
19	individual; JENNIFER PROCH, an individual; TRACY RILES, an individual;
20	URSHALA RIVERS, an individual; MARGARET ROGERS, an individual;
21	TAMANISHA RUBIN, an individual; CARRIE RYAN, an individual; IESHIA
22	SCOTT, an individual; REBECCA SHERRY, an individual; TONYA SIMMS,
23	an individual; JESSICA SMITH, an individual; LINDA TANNER, an
24	individual; CLEO THOMPSON, an individual; CRYSTAL WALDO, an
25	individual; KRISTEN WALKER, an individual; TIFFANY WALKER, an
26	individual; NIKKIA MARTIN, a minor by and through her guardian ad litem, LAURA
27	and through her guardian ad litem, LAURA WASHINGTON; JOYCE WATERS, an individual; CRYSTAL WEAVER, an individual; DAWN WHITE, an individual;
28	MARIE WILLIAMS, an individual;

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

1	SHERITA WILLIAMS, an individual;
2	
3	WRIGHT, an individual,
4	Plaintiff,

1.

4.

ORTHO-MCNEIL PHARMACEUTICAL, INC., a Delaware Corporation; MCKESSON CORP and DOES 1-500, inclusive,

Defendants.

9 10

11

12

13

5

6

7

8

Defendants Ortho-McNeil Pharmaceutical, Inc. ("OMP") and McKesson Corporation ("McKesson) (collectively "Defendants") by and through counsel, hereby respond to the allegations set forth in plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint ("FAC") as follows:

14 15

ANSWER TO INTRODUCTION

17 18

16

Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to plaintiffs' allegations that they used ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 1 of plaintiffs' FAC.

19 20

2. Defendants admit that defendant OMP manufactured, advertised, promoted, marketed, sold and distributed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 2 of plaintiffs' FAC.

21 22

3. Defendants admit that defendant McKesson is a non-exclusive distributor of ORTHO EVRA® and has its principal place of business in San Francisco, California. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 3 of plaintiffs' FAC.

23

24 25

26

Defendants admit that on the ORTHO EVRA® Web site, it states that: "The transdermal -- or 'through the skin' -- weekly birth control patch prevents pregnancy by delivering continuous levels of the hormones norelgestromin and ethinyl

27

28

estradiol (progestin and estrogen, respectively) through the skin and into the

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

SF1\387608\1

8

18

17

20

21

19

22 23

24

25

26 27

28 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

SF1\387608\1

bloodstream." Defendants admit that the FDA approved the use of ORTHO EVRA® for
the prevention of pregnancy in November 2001. Defendants further admit that the FDA's
publications state what they state. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained
in paragraph 4 of plaintiffs' FAC.

ANSWER TO JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. Paragraph 5 of plaintiffs' FAC contains legal conclusions to which no response is required.
- 6. Defendants admit that defendant OMP is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in New Jersey, and defendant McKesson is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in California. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 6 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 7. Defendants admit that defendant McKesson has its principal place of business in San Francisco, California. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 7 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 8. Defendants admit that defendant McKesson has its principal place of business in San Francisco, California. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 8 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 9. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the allegations contained in paragraph 9 of plaintiffs' FAC.

ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS

- 10. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 10 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 11. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 11 of plaintiffs' FAC.

5

12

10

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

27

28

26

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor an Francisco, CA 94105

12.	Defend	dants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belief as to v	where pl	aintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed
ORTHO EV	RA®.	Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 12
of plaintiffs'	FAC.	

- 13. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 13 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 14. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 14 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 15. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 15 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 16. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 16 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a 17. belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 17 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 18. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 18 of plaintiffs' FAC.

CASE No.

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

19.	Defer	idants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belief as to	where p	laintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed
ORTHO E	VRA®.	Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 19
of plaintiffs	s' FAC.	

- 20. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 20 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 21. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 21 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 22. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 22 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 23. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 23 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 24. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 24 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 25. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 25 of plaintiffs' FAC.

7

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

RINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor n Francisco, CA 94105

26.	Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belief as to w	here plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed
ORTHO EVI	RA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 26
of plaintiffs'	FAC.

- 27. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 27 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 28. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 28 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 29. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 29 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 30. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 30 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 31. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 31 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 32. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 32 of plaintiffs' FAC.

5

9

13

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28

RINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor an Francisco, CA 94105

33.	Defer	ndants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belief as to	where p	laintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed
ORTHO EV	RA®.	Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 33
of plaintiffs	FAC.	

- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a 34. belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 34 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 35. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 35 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 36. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 36 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 37. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 37 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 38. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 38 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 39. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 39 of plaintiffs' FAC.

5

14

12

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor rancisco, CA 94105

4	0. Def	endants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belief a	s to where	plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed
ORTHO) EVRA®	. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 40
of plain	tiffs' FAC	

- 41. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 41 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 42. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 42 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 43. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 43 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 44. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 44 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a 45. belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 45 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 46. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 46 of plaintiffs' FAC.

47.	Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belief as to w	here plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed
ORTHO EVI	RA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 47
of plaintiffs'	FAC.

- 48. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 48 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 49. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 49 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 50. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 50 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 51. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 51 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 52. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 52 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 53. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 53 of plaintiffs' FAC.

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor an Francisco, CA 94105

22

23

24

25

26

27

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor Francisco, CA 94105

54.	Defen	dants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belief as to w	here p	laintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed
ORTHO EVI	RA®.	Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 54
of plaintiffs'	FAC.	

- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a 55. belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 55 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 56. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 56 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 57. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 57 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 58. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 58 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 59. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 59 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 60. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 60 of plaintiffs' FAC.

1
2
3
4
5

6

10

9

12

13

11

14 15

16

18

17

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94105

61.	Defer	idants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belief as to v	where p	laintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed
ORTHO EV	'RA®.	Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 61
of plaintiffs'	FAC.	

- 62. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 62 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 63. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 63 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 64. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 64 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 65. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 65 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 66. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 66 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 67. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 67 of plaintiffs' FAC.

14

12

15

17

16

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

27

26

28

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor an Francisco, CA 94105

	68.	Defen	dants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belie	f as to w	here p	laintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed
ORT	HO EVI	RA®.	Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 68
of pla	aintiffs'	FAC.	

- 69. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 69 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 70. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 70 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 71. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 71 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a 72. belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 72 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a 73. belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 73 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 74. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 74 of plaintiffs' FAC.

10

8

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27

28

KER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor Francisco, CA 94105

	75.	Defen	dants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belief a	as to w	here p	aintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed
ORTH	O EVI	RA®.	Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 75
of plair	ntiffs'	FAC.	

- 76. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 76 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 77. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 77 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a 78. belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 78 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 79. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 79 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 80. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 80 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 81. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 81 of plaintiffs' FAC.

12

14

16

15

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

	82.	Defen	idants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belief	as to w	here p	laintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed
ORTI	HO EVI	RA®.	Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 82
of pla	intiffs'	FAC.	

- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a 83. belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 83 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 84. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 84 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 85. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 85 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a 86. belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 86 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 87. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 87 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 88. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 88 of plaintiffs' FAC.

5

12

10

	89.	Defen	idants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a	
belief	as to w	here p	laintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed	
ORTI	IO EVI	RA®.	Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph	89
of pla	intiffs'	FAC.		

- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a 90. belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 90 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 91. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 91 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 92. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 92 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 93. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 93 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 94. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 94 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 95. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 95 of plaintiffs' FAC.

96.	Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belief as to w	here plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed
ORTHO EVI	RA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 96
of plaintiffs'	FAC.

- 97. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 97 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 98. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 98 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 99. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 99 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 100. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 100 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 101. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 101 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 102. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 102 of plaintiffs' FAC.

6

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26 27

28

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor an Francisco, CA 94105

103. Defend	ants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belief as to where pla	intiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed
ORTHO EVRA®. I	Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph
103 of plaintiffs' FAG	C.

Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to where plaintiff resides or plaintiff's allegations that she was prescribed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 104 of plaintiffs' FAC.

ANSWER TO DEFENDANTS

- Defendants admit that defendant OMP is a Delaware corporation with its 105. principal place of business in New Jersey. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 105 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 106. Defendants admit that defendant OMP conducts business in California. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 106 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 107 of plaintiffs' 107. FAC.
- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a 108. belief as to the allegations contained in paragraph 108 of plaintiffs' FAC, and therefore these allegations are denied.
- 109. Defendants admit that defendant OMP manufactured, marketed, promoted, sold and distributed ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 109 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants admit that defendant McKesson is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in San Francisco, California. Defendants further admit that defendant McKesson conducts business in California. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 110 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 111. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 111 of plaintiffs' FAC.

9

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor an Francisco, CA 94105

112. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belief as to the allegations contained in paragraph 112 of plaintiffs' FAC, and therefor
these allegations are denied.

- Defendants admit that defendant McKesson is a non-exclusive distributor 113. of ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 113 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 114. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the allegations contained in paragraph 114 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the allegations contained in paragraph 115 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- To the extent that paragraph 116 of plaintiffs' FAC alleges improper 116. conduct on the part of defendants, such allegations are denied.
- To the extent that paragraph 117 of plaintiffs' FAC alleges improper 117. conduct on the part of defendants, such allegations are denied.

ANSWER TO GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- Defendant OMP admits that on the Ortho-McNeil Pharmaceutical, Inc. Web site, it states that: "Ortho-McNeil Pharmaceutical is a pioneer in contraception and a leader in women's health care. Ortho-McNeil offers the broadest range of prescription birth control options..." Defendant OMP further admits that it manufactures and sells ORTHO EVRA®, the first combination transdermal contraceptive patch. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 118 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendant OMP admits that ORTHO EVRA® is the first and only once-a-119. week birth control patch. Defendant OMP further admits that on the ORTHO EVRA® Web site, it states that: "The transdermal -- or 'through the skin' -- weekly birth control patch prevents pregnancy by delivering continuous levels of the hormones norelgestromin and ethinyl estradiol (progestin and estrogen, respectively) through the skin and into the bloodstream." Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 119 of plaintiffs' FAC.

8

9

6

17

21

120.	Defendants admit that a New Drug Application ("NDA") was filed for
ORTHO EV	RA®, denoted as 21-180, with the FDA in December 2000. Defendants
further admi	t that the FDA Medical Officer's Review for ORTHO EVRA® states what it
states. Defe	ndants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 120 of
plaintiffs' FA	AC.

- Defendants admit that the FDA approved the use of ORTHO EVRA® for the prevention of pregnancy in November 2001. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 121 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants admit that as with all prescription medicine, adverse events are reported to the FDA by a variety of people and entities. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 122 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants admit that the FDA's publications state what they state. 123. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 123 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants admit that the November 2005 package insert for ORTHO EVRA® states what it states. To the extent that paragraph 124 of plaintiffs' FAC alleges improper conduct on the part of defendants, such allegations are denied.
- Defendant OMP admits that ORTHO EVRA® is the first and only once-aweek birth control patch. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 125 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 126 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants admit that the package insert for ORTHO EVRA® states what it states. To the extent that paragraph 127 of plaintiffs' FAC alleges improper conduct on the part of defendants, such allegations are denied.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 128 of plaintiffs' 128. FAC.
- Defendants state that they were subject only to those duties imposed by applicable law, and deny the allegations contained in paragraph 129 of plaintiffs' FAC to

the extent they suggest any different or greater duties. Defendants further deny that they failed to abide by any applicable legal duties.

- 130. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 130 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 131. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 131 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 132. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 132 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 133. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 133 of plaintiffs' FAC.

ANSWER TO FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT

- 134. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 134 of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 135. Defendants state that they were subject only to those duties imposed by applicable law, and deny the allegations contained in paragraph 135 of plaintiffs' FAC to the extent they suggest any different or greater duties. Defendants further deny that they failed to abide by any applicable legal duties, and deny the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

ANSWER TO FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION NEGLIGENCE

- 136. Defendants repeat their answers to the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 135 of plaintiffs' FAC as if set forth at length herein.
- 137. Defendants state that they were subject only to those duties imposed by applicable law, and deny the allegations contained in paragraph 137 of the First Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC to the extent they suggest any different or greater duties. Defendants further deny that they failed to abide by any applicable legal duties.
 - 138. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 138 of the First

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

26

27

15

17

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor an Francisco, CA 94105

Cause of Action o	of plaintiffs' FAC.
-------------------	---------------------

- 139. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 139 of the First Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 140 of the First Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 141 of the First Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 142 of the First 142. Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 143 of the First Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegation that ORTHO EVRA® is defective, and deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 144 of the First Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 145. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 145 of the First Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 146 of the First Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC and controvert the prayers for relief set forth in the unnumbered paragraph following paragraph 146.

ANSWER TO SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION STRICT PRODUCT LIABILITY – FAILURE TO WARN

- Defendants repeat their answers to the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 146 of plaintiffs' FAC as if set forth at length herein.
- 148. Defendants admit that defendant OMP manufactures and supplies ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 148 of the Second Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
 - 149. Defendants admit that defendant OMP manufactures and supplies ORTHO

13

15

27

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

EVRA®.	Defendants of	deny the remain	ing allegations	contained	ın paragraph	149	of the
Second C	ause of Actio	n of plaintiffs'	FAC.				

- 150. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 150 of the Second Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 151. Defendants deny the allegation that ORTHO EVRA® is defective, and deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 151 of the Second Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 152. Defendants deny the allegation that ORTHO EVRA® is defective, and deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 152 of the Second Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 153. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 153 of the Second Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 154. Defendants deny the allegation that ORTHO EVRA® is defective, and deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 154 of the Second Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 155. Defendants deny the allegation that ORTHO EVRA® is defective, and deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 155 of the Second Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 156. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 156 of the Second Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 157. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 157 of the Second Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 158. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 158 of the Second Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 159. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 159 of the Second Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC and controvert the prayers for relief set forth in the unnumbered paragraph following paragraph 159.

3

45

67

8

10 11

12

13 14

1516

17

18 19

20

22

21

2324

25

26

2728

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH ILLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

ANSWER TO THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY

- 160. Defendants repeat their answers to the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 159 of plaintiffs' FAC as if set forth at length herein.
- 161. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 161 of the Third Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 162. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 162 of the Third Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 163. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 163 of the Third Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 164. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 164 of the Third Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 165. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 165 of the Third Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 166. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 166 of the Third Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 167. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 167 of the Third Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 168. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 168 of the Third Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 169. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 169 of the Third Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC and controvert the prayers for relief set forth in the unnumbered paragraph following paragraph 169.

ANSWER TO FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY

170. Defendants repeat their answers to the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 169 of plaintiffs' FAC as if set forth at length herein.

- 171. Defendants admit that defendant OMP marketed, sold and distributed ORTHO EVRA®, which is used for the prevention of pregnancy. Defendants further admit that defendant McKesson is a non-exclusive distributor of ORTHO EVRA®, and deny that defendant McKesson marketed or sold ORTHO EVRA®. The remainder of paragraph 171 of the Fourth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC contains a legal conclusion to which no response is required.
- 172. Paragraph 172 of the Fourth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC contains legal conclusions to which no response is required.
- 173. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the allegations contained in paragraph 173 of the Fourth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC, and therefore these allegations are denied.
- 174. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 174 of the Fourth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 175. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 175 of the Fourth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 176. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 176 of the Fourth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 177. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 177 of the Fourth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC and controvert the prayers for relief set forth in the unnumbered paragraph following paragraph 177.

ANSWER TO FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION

- 178. Defendants repeat their answers to the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 177 of plaintiffs' FAC as if set forth at length herein.
- 179. Defendants admit that defendant OMP manufactures, markets, promotes, and sells ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants further state that they were subject only to those duties imposed by applicable law, and deny the allegations contained in this paragraph to

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

SF1\387608\1

22

23

24

25

26

27

the extent they suggest any different or greater duties. Defendants further deny that they failed to abide by any applicable legal duties, and deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 179 of the Fifth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.

- 180. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 180 of the Fifth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 181. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 181 of the Fifth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 182. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 182 of the Fifth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 183. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 183 of the Fifth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 184. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 184 of the Fifth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC and controvert the prayers for relief set forth in the unnumbered paragraph following paragraph 184.

ANSWER TO SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION FRAUD

- 185. Defendants repeat their answers to the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 184 of plaintiffs' FAC as if set forth at length herein.
- 186. Defendants admit that defendant OMP manufactures, markets, promotes, and sells ORTHO EVRA®. Defendants further state that they were subject only to those duties imposed by applicable law, and deny the allegations contained in this paragraph to the extent they suggest any different or greater duties. Defendants further deny that they failed to abide by any applicable legal duties, and deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 186 of the Sixth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 187. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 187 of the Sixth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
 - 188. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 188 of the Sixth

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

SF1\387608\1

25

26

27

Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.

- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 189 of the Sixth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 190 of the Sixth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 191 of the Sixth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 192 of the Sixth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 193 of the Sixth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to plaintiffs' states of mind. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 194 of the Sixth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- 195. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 195 of the Sixth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 196 of the Sixth 196. Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 197 of the Sixth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 198 of the Sixth Cause of Action of plaintiffs' FAC and controvert the prayers for relief set forth in the unnumbered paragraph following paragraph 198.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' FAC fails to state a claim against Defendants upon which relief may be granted.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

28

26

27

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

SF1\387608\1

Venue is improper in this court.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs are fraudulently joined and/or misjoined, and the court should sever Plaintiffs' claims and/or enter other appropriate orders to avoid prejudice, unfairness, hardship, delay, and undue expense and to promote convenience and expedience.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, to the extent certain Plaintiffs have asserted duplicative claims in one or more other actions pending against some or all of the same defendants.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the applicable statute of limitations, statute of repose and/or by the equitable doctrines of laches and estoppel.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the doctrines of informed consent, release and waiver.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred because the alleged damages, if any are proven, were not proximately caused by any act or omission of any of the Defendants.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

If Plaintiffs suffered any of the injuries, losses and damages alleged, then said injuries, losses and damages were a direct and proximate result of a responsible, superseding, and/or intervening cause.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendants state that if Plaintiffs have suffered any of the injuries, losses and damages alleged, then said injuries, losses and damages were due to an allergic,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

7

5

1011

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25

2627

28

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105 idiosyncratic or idiopathic reaction to the product at issue in this case, or by an unforeseeable illness, unavoidable accident or preexisting condition, without any negligence and culpable conduct by Defendants.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' injuries and damages, if any, were caused in whole or in part by the acts (wrongful or otherwise), negligence, sole fault, misuse, abuse, modification, alteration, omission or fault of one or more persons or entities over whom Defendants exercised no control and for whom Defendants are not legally responsible, including, without limitation, Plaintiffs.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs failed to exercise reasonable care and diligence to mitigate injuries and damages, if any.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the "state of the art" and "state of scientific knowledge" defenses.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the Learned Intermediary Doctrine.

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The product at issue in this case falls under the auspices of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and regulations promulgated by the Federal Food & Drug Administration, and therefore, Federal law preempts Plaintiffs' claims. *See*, 21 U.S.C. § 301 *et. seq. See also*, 71 Fed. Reg. 3922 (January 24, 2006).

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendants did not make to Plaintiffs nor did they breach any express or implied warranties and/or breach any warranties created by law. To the extent that Plaintiffs rely on any theory of breach of warranty, such claims are barred by applicable law, and for

_	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

lack of privity with Defendants and/or for failure of Plaintiffs, or Plaintiffs' representatives, to give timely notice to Defendants of any alleged breach of warranty. Plaintiffs did not rely on any alleged warranty. Defendants further specifically plead as to any breach of warranty claim all affirmative defenses under the Uniform Commercial Code existing and which may arise in the future, as enacted in the State of California, and any other state whose law is deemed to apply in this case.

SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred by comments j and k to Section 402A of the Restatement (Second) of Torts.

SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims of product defects are barred by Section 2, 4, and 6(c) and (d) of the Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability.

EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' product liability claims are barred because the benefits of the relevant product outweighed its risks.

NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or part because the product at issue was at all times properly prepared, packaged, and distributed, and was not defective or unreasonably dangerous.

TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Any imposition of punitive damages in this case against Defendants is barred to the extent that the manner in which such punitive damages are calculated violates the Constitution of the United States or the Constitution of the State of California.

TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Any award of punitive damages in this case against Defendants is barred to the extent that the amount of such an award violates the Constitution of the United States or

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floo San Francisco, CA 94105

26

the Constitution of the State of California.

TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs have failed to plead fraud with specificity.

TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendants are entitled to a setoff for all amounts paid, payable by or available from collateral sources.

TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The FAC fails to state a cause of action against Defendants because there is no private right of action under the applicable federal law. To the extent Plaintiffs' claims are based on alleged misrepresentations or omissions made to FDA, such claims are barred pursuant to <u>Buckman v. Plaintiffs' Legal Community</u>, 531 U.S. 341 (2001).

TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs knowingly and voluntarily assumed any and all risks associated with the use of the product at issue, barring in whole or in part the damages Plaintiffs seek to recover.

TWENTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

In the event Defendants, or any of them, are held liable to Plaintiffs, or any of them, which liability is expressly denied, or a settlement of judgment against Defendants, or any of them, is reached, Defendants request an apportionment of fault be made as permitted by <u>Li v. Yellow Cab Company</u>, 13 Cal.3d 804 (1975) and <u>American Motorcycle Association v. Superior Court</u>, 20 Cal.3d 578 (1987) and a judgment and declaration of indemnification and contribution be entered against all other persons and entities in accordance with that apportionment of fault.

TWENTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The amount of any award on behalf of plaintiffs, or any of them, for non-economic loss must be allocated according to the provisions of California Civil Code Section 1431.2 ("Proposition 51").

28
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105

Sec. 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

TWENTY- EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendants specifically reserve the right to amend their Answer by adding defenses, counterclaims, cross claims or by instituting third party actions as additional facts are obtained.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered, Defendants specifically controvert Plaintiffs' Prayer for Relief including Paragraphs (1)-(6).

JURY DEMAND

Defendants hereby demand a trial by jury of all the facts and issues in this case pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b).

Dated: August 2, 2007

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

MATTHEW P. SMITH Attorneys for Defendants

ORTHO-MCNEIL PHARMACEUTICAL, INC. and MCKESSON CORPORATION

23242526

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

27

28

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105